

Serial No. 10/046,607

RD-25,993-7

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the consideration shown by the Office, as evidenced by the Office Action, mailed on July 2, 2003. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 4-8, 12, 17-19, and 52-58. Claims 62-73, which had been previously withdrawn, have been canceled, without prejudice, in the present Amendment. As such, Claims 4-8, 12, 17-19, and 52-58 remain in the case with none of the claims being allowed.

The July 2 Office Action has been carefully considered. After such consideration, Claim 62-73 have been canceled, without prejudice. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application by the Examiner in light of the above amendments and the following remarks offered in response to the July 2 Office Action.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 4-8, 12, 17-19 and 52-58 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The Examiner states that, in Claim 4, line 1, the preamble introduces "an article" and that the claim, in the last line, refers to "the substrate." Applicants submit that the preamble of Claim 4 has been amended to replace "article" with --substrate-- to provide proper antecedent basis for the latter term.

The Examiner states that Claim 5 recites that the first material or the second material comprises an evaporated elemental metal, while Claim 4 had previously required that the first material be an organosilicon material. Applicants submit that Claim 4 has been amended in part to recite the limitations of injecting a first material comprising at least one of a polymerizable hydrocarbon and an organosilicon material and injecting a second material comprising at least one of an elemental metal and an organometallic compound. Support for the amendments is found on page 11, lines 28-31; page 14, lines 8-10; and page 17, lines 30-32, of the specification. In addition, Claim 5 has been amended by deleting "first material or" from the claim. Applicants submit that, as a

Serial No. 10/046,607

RD-25,993-7

result of the amendments to Claims 4 and 5, Claim 5 now properly depends from Claim 4.

The Examiner also cites the "unclear intent" of Claims 7 and 17-19. Applicants submit that Claim 7 has been amended to recite the limitation that the third material comprises a second (rather than third) organosilicon material. Applicants submit that the amendment to Claim 7, when considered with the previously described amendments to Claims 4 and 5, clarifies the intent of Claim 7. Regarding the "intent" of Claims 17-19, Applicants submit that these claims, as well as Claim 12, are now in proper dependent form, as they further limit the claims from which they depend.

The Examiner further states that Claims 4-8, 12, 17-19 and 52-58 introduce new matter, as the original specification contained no disclosure for combining organosilicon and evaporated metal for depositing either the first or second layers. Applicants submit that the amended claims, and Claim 4 in particular, do not introduce new matter.

The Examiner has recommended that "an" be changed to --the-- before "ultraviolet absorbing material" and "abrasion resistant material" in Claims 53-56. Applicants submit that claims 54-56 have been amended accordingly to provide proper antecedent basis. For these terms

Applicants submit that by amending the claims as described above, the rejection of Claims 4-8, 12, 17-19 and 52-58 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, are successfully overcome.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification due to informalities, and has required that blanks for serial numbers and/or patent numbers be filled in. Applicants submit that the specification has been amended accordingly to comply with the Examiner's requirements.

Serial No. 10/046,607

RD-25,993-7

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4, 6, and 53-57 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu et al. (U.S. Patent 5,718,967) in view of Schramm et al. (U.S. Patent 4,871,580).

Applicants respectfully submit that the combinations of reference proposed by the Examiner neither teaches nor suggests all of the limitations of amended independent Claim 4 and the claims dependent thereon.

Applicants submit that the combination of Hu et al. and Schramm et al. does not teach the steps of injecting a first material comprising at least one of a polymerizable hydrocarbon and an organosilicon material and a first oxidant into the plasma and reacting the first material to form an interlayer, injecting a second material comprising at least one of an elemental metal and an organometallic compound and a second oxidant into the plasma and reacting the second material to form a second layer comprising an inorganic ultraviolet absorbing material on the interlayer, wherein the interlayer has a coefficient of thermal expansion that is between that of the substrate and the second layer, as recited in amended Claim 4. Applicants submit that Hu et al. neither disclose nor suggest forming an interlayer having a coefficient of thermal expansion that is between that of the substrate and the second layer. Instead, the reference teaches the formation of an *adhesion promoter layer* of plasma polymerized tetramethyldisiloxane on a plastic substrate, a second layer of plasma polymerized organosilicon compound, and an outer layer. Applicants submit that Schramm et al. teach a plasma treatment method, and are silent as to specific materials that may be deposited on a substrate and as to the coefficient of thermal expansion of the interlayer.

Applicants therefore submit that, because the combination of references fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 4, the rejection of Claims 4, 6, and 53-57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu et al. in view of Schramm et al. is successfully overcome.

Serial No. 10/046,607

RD-25,993-7

Claims 4, 6, and 53-57 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang et al. (EPO 0 887 437 A2), in view of Hu et al. and optionally in view of Schramm et al.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither of these combinations of references either teaches nor suggests all of the limitations of amended independent Claim 4 and the claims dependent thereon.

Applicants submit that Yang et al. does not disclose does not teach injecting a first material comprising at least one of a polymerizable hydrocarbon and an organosilicon material and a first oxidant into the plasma and reacting the first material to form an interlayer, injecting a second material comprising at least one of an elemental metal and an organometallic compound and a second oxidant into the plasma and reacting the second material to form a second layer comprising an inorganic ultraviolet absorbing material on the interlayer, wherein the interlayer has a coefficient of thermal expansion that is between that of the substrate and the second layer, as recited in amended Claim 4. As previously presented, both Hu et al. both Schramm et al. fail to provide these limitations.

Applicants therefore submit that, because the proposed combinations of references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended independent Claim 4, the rejection of Claims 4, 6, and 53-57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang et al. alone or in view in view of Hu et al. and optionally in view of Schramm et al. is successfully traversed.

Claims 5, 7-8, 12, and 17-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang et al. in view of Hu et al., and optionally in view of Schramm et al. and in further view of Tomanaga et al. or Reed et al. (U.S. Patent 4,927,704), and optionally considering Schiller et al. (087) or Thurm et al.

Serial No. 10/046,607

RD-25,993-7

Applicants submit that, as previously presented, the rejections of independent Claim 4, from which Claims 5, 7-8, 12, and 17-18 depend, have been overcome, and the independent claim is now in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that, because base Claim 4 is now allowable, dependent Claims 5, 7-8, 12, and 17-18 must also contain allowable subject matter. Therefore, the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang et al. in combination with Hu et al., Schramm et al. and in Tomanaga et al., Reed et al., and, optionally, Schramm et al., Schiller et al., and Thurm et al. is therefore successfully overcome.

In light of the amendment and remarks presented herein, Applicant submits that the case is in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully requests such action. If, however, any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicant's counsel at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert P. Santandrea
Counsel for Applicants
Registration No. 45,072
Telephone: (518) 387-6304 or
(518) 387-7122

Schenectady, New York
October 2, 2003

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 02 2003

OFFICIAL